

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 LEVI DALE LASTER, JR., No. 2:25-cv-0979 DJC CSK P  
12 Plaintiff,  
13 v. ORDER  
14 KIMBERLY CHEATLEY, et al.,  
15 Defendants.

17 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights action seeking  
18 relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate  
19 Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

20 On April 24, 2025, the Magistrate Judge filed findings and recommendations  
21 herein which were served on Plaintiff and which contained notice to Plaintiff that any  
22 objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen  
23 days. Plaintiff filed objections to the findings and recommendations. (ECF No. 13.)

24 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule  
25 304, this Court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully  
26 reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be  
27 supported by the record and by proper analysis.

28 |||

1       Despite being denied leave to amend, Plaintiff filed a "Complaint for a Civil  
 2 Case" on May 9, 2025. (ECF No. 15.) However, contrary to Plaintiff's claim (ECF No.  
 3 15 at 14), that filing does not "fix" his complaint. The filing is largely  
 4 incomprehensible, and contains two petitions for writs of habeas corpus.<sup>1</sup> (*Id.* at 2,  
 5 36.) As defendants, Plaintiff again names Alexzadria Kent, "dope cook," and  
 6 Kimberley Cheatley, "resigned Secret Service," and now attempts to add a third  
 7 defendant, Matthew P. Beavers, "crooked military general." (*Id.* at 16.) Because  
 8 Plaintiff's filing is incomprehensible, the Court disregards Plaintiff's May 9, 2025 filing.

9       On May 16, 2025, Plaintiff filed another complaint, naming the same three  
 10 Defendants as named in his May 9, 2025 filing, and the May 16, 2025 filing is similarly  
 11 incomprehensible. (ECF No. 17.) The May 16, 2025 filing is also disregarded.

12       Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 13       1. The findings and recommendations (ECF No. 12) are adopted in full.
- 14       2. Plaintiff's requests to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF Nos. 6, 7, 9, 14) are  
 15 denied;
- 16       3. Plaintiff's May 9 and 16, 2025 filings (ECF Nos. 15, 17) are disregarded; and
- 17       4. This action is dismissed as frivolous, with prejudice.
- 18       5. The Clerk of the Court is directed to administratively terminate all pending  
 19 motions and close this case.

20       IT IS SO ORDERED.

21       Dated: May 30, 2025

  
 22 Hon. Daniel J. Calabretta  
 23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

24

---

25       <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff already has petitions for writs of habeas corpus pending in the Eastern District. See Laster v.  
 26 State of Cal., No. 2:25-cv-0481 SCR (E.D. Cal.); Laster v. Cheatley, No. 2:25-cv-1098 EFB (E.D. Cal.); and  
Laster v. Robinson, No. 25-cv-1099 AC (E.D. Cal.). A court may take judicial notice of court records.  
See, e.g., Bennett v. Medtronic, Inc., 285 F.3d 801, 803 n.2 (9th Cir. 2002) ("[W]e may take notice of  
 27 proceedings in other courts, both within and without the federal judicial system, if those proceedings  
 28 have a direct relation to matters at issue") (internal quotation omitted).